

SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 13, 2009

SWAC Members

Mark Glazer, Chair	Marcia Harrington	Craig Simoneau
Steve Findley	Ed Lee	Steve Sprague
David Frank	Lee Levine	Ed Violette
Odell Hall	Marcia Marks	

Absent: L. Alexander and P. Jenson

County Staff

Guests

Bill Davidson, DSWS	Angela Jordan, DSWS
Marilu Enciso, DSWS	Eileen Kao, DSWS
Robin Ennis, DSWS	Alan Pultyniewicz, DSWS

The regular meeting of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) was called to order by the Chair at 7:36 p.m. on January 13, 2009, at the Executive Office Building Lobby Level Auditorium.

The Chair welcomed everyone at the meeting, and introductions were made.

OLD BUSINESS

Meeting Minutes – The minutes of the November 15, 2008 meeting were approved as submitted.

Subcommittee/ Reports – The Nominating committee met on Thursday, December 18, 2008 to interview candidates to fill vacant SWAC seats. The interviews went well, and three people were chosen to be nominated for appointment by the County Executive to SWAC.

The School Recycling committee met prior to the regular meeting to discuss MCPS recycling issues. The committee reported being baffled that MCPS is stuck at a 28 percent recycling rate. They are optimistic about the strides that have been made in the school recycling programs.

- The School Energy and Recycling Team (SERT) program was developed to promote awareness in order to increase recycling rates in the Montgomery County school system through communication, respect, and recognition.
- Paper milk cartons that were placed in the trash have been replaced with recyclable plastic milk bottles.

- The school Superintendent has gone on record as being behind the school recycling programs.
- The number of schools that received a grade of an “F” on their annual recycling infrastructure evaluations conducted by DSWS dropped from eleven to two.

It was reported that the Planning Committee had met on December 29, 2008 to discuss the draft update of the 10- Year Solid Waste Management Plan and also the DSWS decision not to change to Single Stream recycling. Draft 10-Year Plans and a large notebook supporting the single-stream decision had been distributed to the subcommittee. There was strong support for not changing to single-stream. Mr. Davidson summarized the details of the plan to the committee. DSWS analysis in the Plan indicates that the fifty percent recycling rate remains an aggressive and feasible goal. The committee believes that food and green waste continue to be a problem, and that composting should be enforced in businesses, restaurants, and institutions. Mr. Davidson mentioned that the draft 10-Year Plan indicates that composting capacity of 20,000 tons/year needs to be added in the County system.

SWAC's DAFIG representative Ed Violette reported that there was a unanimous objection to closing the Beauty Spots. There is concern that illegal dumping will sharply increase, as it did in years past when certain items were no longer accepted there. He also reported that deer continue to be a problem. DAFIG would like to see an amendment to lease agreements regarding hunting season.

### MAJOR PROGRAM TOPIC

A presentation was made by Mr. Bill Davidson of DSWS on the decision not to change to Single-Stream Recycling. He spoke from the three-page summary that had previously been distributed to the SWAC, noting that detailed information was in the large notebooks that had been distributed to the Planning Committee. Mr. Davidson also noted that this was a collaborative effort on the part of all DSWS managers and key staff. Speaking from the Summary, he gave an overview of the key findings, which fell into four areas:

- Current System Works: The existing system is operating well and is high-achieving for the single-family sector.
- Absence of Factors Cited by Switching Jurisdictions: DSWS surveyed jurisdictions, nationwide, which had considered switching. There is an absence in Montgomery County of the factors cited by those who switched as being key to their decision.
- No Clear Fiscal Advantage – Changes in three main driving cost factors were considered—collection, processing and public outreach and education. MRF staff had determined that changes there would cost over \$8 million in capital and then an ongoing annual increased cost of over \$2.5 million. Added public education would add over \$4

million cost. There might be potential savings in collection costs alone, but these are highly uncertain (10 to 20 percent). Assuming a 20 percent savings in collection costs, in combination with those system cost increases mentioned, might yield an overall 20-year net present value cost savings of \$18 million. However, Montgomery County has already captured important collection cost savings, when a switch was made to dual-compartment, high capacity compacting trucks. Assuming only a 10 percent savings in collection costs by now switching to single-stream changes the 20-year net present value to an increase of \$35 million in County expenses. There is no compelling fiscal reason to make a change from the present system.

- The DSWS staff does not recommend a conversion to single-stream recycling within this plan. Single-stream recycling may be reconsidered in the future, when the useful life cycle of the MRF is coming to an end. The thought of DSWS is “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it”. Many jurisdictions are adopting a single-stream system to increase recycling rates, and there have been favorable results, but there is no clear evidence that a single-stream system is the sole rationale. The down side is that some jurisdictions have to pay get rid of their recyclables.
- Potential to Introduce Factors Counter to Sustainability Objectives: Down-cycling – With single stream, there is a need to introduce a new mechanical separation as a first step in processing, which new first step, no matter how it is accomplished, can be expected to reduce product qualities. Down-cycling is described as the process of recovering recyclable material that ends up being used to produce a product and less likely to be recycled repeatedly. The chances of down-cycling are increased when material is recovered from a single-stream system. Also, there could be lost revenue in dealing with recyclables from a single-stream system, due to the higher percentage of contaminated recyclable material recovered.
- There was a question about Residents’ potential perceptions about relative ease of recycling with single stream versus using two containers. DSWS referred to a recently conducted County-wide survey which included a question about that. The survey was done by a professional firm and designed to assure representative result. Participants were asked a series of questions to be answered with “very helpful” or “not at all helpful”. The surveys resulted in no significant difference in the number of households that were in favor of single-stream recycling.

## NEW BUSINESS

- The Chair reminded the committee that the meeting with County Executive would be held on Wednesday, February 11, 2009 at 9pm. He called for three members to represent SWAC. The purpose of this meeting is to address any issues/concerns the committee might have. With the state of the economy, and the County's budget shortfall, the Chair reminded members not to "stir the pot" with any budgetary matters, but to instead thank Mr. Leggett for supporting the recycling efforts in Montgomery County. SWAC wants to have the following items addressed:
  - Increased education and outreach on recycling initiatives.
  - The need for MCPS to reach their recycling goals.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

No comments.

#### ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

#### ACRONYMS

DAFIG	Dickerson Area Facilities Implementation Group
MCPS	Montgomery County Public Schools
MES	Maryland Environmental Service
MRF	Montgomery Recycling Facility
SWAC	Solid Waste Advisory Committee

SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE														
2007 ATTENDANCE														
	J A N	F E B	M A R	A P R	M A Y	J U N	J U L	A U G	S E P	O C T	N O V	D E C	Absences In Last 12 Months	
Alexander, Leslie									X	X	X			
Faul-Zeitler, Bobbie		X	X		X	X			X	X	X		-1	
Frank, David			X		X	X			X	X	X		-1	
Glazer, Mark		X	X			X			X	X	X		-1	
Guernica, Mimi									X	X			-1	
Hall, Odell		X			X	X			X	X			-2	
Harrington, Marcia									X	X	X			
Levine, Lee		X	X			X			X		X		-2	
Marks, Marcia									X	X	X			
Simoneau, Craig		X	X		X	X			X	X	X			

SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE														
2008 ATTENDANCE														
	J A N	F E B	M A R	A P R	M A Y	J U N	J U L	A U G	S E P	O C T	N O V	D E C	Absences In Last 12 Months	
Abralind, Jessica		X	X	X	X	X							-1	
Alexander, Leslie		X	X		X	X				X			-3	
Findley, Steve			X	X	X	X				X	X			
Frank, David	X	X	X	X		X				X	X		-1	
Glazer, Mark	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X			
Guernica, Mimi	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X			
Hall, Odell	X		X		X	X				X	X		-2	
Harrington, Marcia	X	X	X	X	X	X				X			-1	
Jenson, Paula		X	X	X	X	X				X	X			
Lee, Ed		X	X	X	X	X					X		-1	
Levine, Lee	X	X	X			X				X	X		-2	
Marks, Marcia	X	X			X	X				X	X		-2	
McCarty, Sean	X	X		X	X						X		-3	
Simoneau, Craig	X	X	X	X	X					X	X		-1	
Sprague, Steve		X	X	X	X	X				X	X			
Violette, Ed				X	X	X				X	X			

SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE														
2009 ATTENDANCE														
	J A N	F E B	M A R	A P R	M A Y	J U N	J U L	A U G	S E P	O C T	N O V	D E C	Absences In Last 12 Months	
Alexander, Leslie										X			-3	Jan '08 dropped off, still at 3 absences
Findley, Steve	X									X	X			
Frank, David	X									X	X		-1	
Glazer, Mark	X									X	X			
										X	X			
Hall, Odell										X	X		-2	
Harrington, Marcia	X									X			-1	
Jenson, Paula										X	X			
Lee, Ed	X										X		-1	
Levine, Lee	X									X	X		-2	
Marks, Marcia	X									X	X		-2	
											X			
Simoneau, Craig	X									X	X		-1	
Sprague, Steve	X									X	X			
Violette, Ed	X									X	X			